Info-ParaNet Newsletters Volume I Number 382

Tuesday, March 26th 1991

Today's Topics:

Re: Fritterheads(tm)
Re: Bill cooper
Re: Philisophical concerns
Rick Redux
Re: Statements of accepta
Re: Bill cooper
Fireball clippings
Goof
Re: Bill Cooper
Re: New Paranet Affiliate
Gravitational Magnetism
Hello & Have You Heard???
Re: New Paranet Affiliate
Openmindedness and psychic phenomena
Rick Redux
Australian SETI success?
Rick Redux
Ss433
Internet Difficulties
The mutliation factor

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Fritterheads(tm)
Date: 21 Mar 91 07:25:54 GMT

> "> I've always been strongly in favour of open-mindedness -- as long
> as "> your mind isn't so open that things flutter in and out.
>
> An excellent way to ignore any opinion that doesn't fit your worldview
> without sacrificing your high moral and ethical standards. Sir, I
> salute you.

It could indeed serve as a pretext for such a stance. If you have any particular evidence that I am in fact doing so, and are not merely engaging in a variety of name-calling, I would be interested to hear it.

Until then, happy fluttering! ;-)

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--
Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Bill cooper
Date: 21 Mar 91 07:31:10 GMT

> "> Sorry Rick; but I can't go along with you on that one. The
> "> purpose of the message was not to protect Bill Cooper from
>
> Forgive me for tuning in late, but what did Bill Cooper do to offend
> the powers-that-be? Had I a collection of any author's frowned-upon
> text, I would be disinclined to trash it for any reason short of a
> court order. I'd rather leave it available, with appropriate editoral
> comments--and allow any foolishness or fritterheadedness to reflect on
> the author hirself.

Exactly my position, except that I personally would dispense with the "appropriate editorial comments". Still, I wouldn't remark that the latter is "an excellent way to denigrate any opinion that doesn't fit your worldview without sacrificing your high moral and ethical standards".

For that would be a cheap shot, and we wouldn't want that, would we?

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--
Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Philisophical concerns
Date: 21 Mar 91 07:40:23 GMT

> I read your continuing debate with boredom at many points. The reason
> is not what you have stated or in some cases what others propose, but
> because of the nit picking out of your statements, mis-quoting, and
> goal-less attacks on motives or people. (that may have been unclear, I
> meant picking parts out of your statements without concern for the
> whole of the material, then arguing one word instead of a concept)
>
> My answer is in this case: "You can lead a horse to water, but you
> can't teach it to do the back stroke!"
>

> Keep trying Rick!

Thanks! I have to shake my head at statements like Jim Greenen's that I "have read enough on this and other BBSs that I should have come to a conclusion that all these claims of UFO sightings has to merit some consideration on your part." That is, of course, exactly what I have been doing all along, and is wlargely what I am in fact here for. I surely haven't gone a large distance out of my way, talking to UFOlogists and UFO buff, and hubbing for their e-mail, merely in order to ignore what they have to say.

As they say en Francais, "Incroyable!"

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--
Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Rick Redux
Date: 21 Mar 91 08:02:06 GMT

Hello, folks --

In order to save echo bandwidth, I've decided to change my mind and admit publicly that I'm really a closed-minded zealot who's here to attack people for their beliefs, ignore overwhelming evidence that might serve to undermine my faith in my ideology and divert me from my hidden agenda, and basically to test how dark the depths of my soul really are.

Since I've now Confessed All, we can regard those subjects as closed (unless, of course, you really really want to castigate me for the above, in which case I'll be glad to oblige).

Oh, I almost forgot about my employment as a government disinformation agent, but that's a story for another message....

Wickedly Yours,
Rick M.

--
Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: Statements of accepta
Date: 23 Mar 91 06:04:00 GMT

->   As I wade through this tangled web of lame
->rationalization, I must
->yet remember that when I asked for the references to the
->material with
->which you (and you say Jim also) are all too familiar, you
->were unable
->to supply them. (Jim, if you're there, can you help out
->here?)

Golly, wish I could, John, but I can't seem to get a handle on what the hell you guys are arguing about. The rhetoric seems to be getting piled pretty high here. If you're asking me what Shaeffer, Klass, et al have held out as criteria for proof of UFO reality, I do have some idea, but the references would be mostly personal conversations. Will that do? As I posted here earlier, Shaeffer once told me that he would "take a long look at" any case that involved "multiple independent photos of the same anomalous object." Carl Sagan is reportedly looking for a cocktail napkin from on board a UFO. I *believe* Klass is looking for some kind of official statement from a body such as the National Academy of Sciences (*if* that is his criteria, I consider it a neat dodge of the real issue). I have no idea what Oberg would accept. He does not seem to be in the same boat with the others; he tends to restrict himself to commenting on those cases which he believes he has explained, and does not seem bent on extrapolating his explanations to wave away the entire phenomenon.

As to the rest of the argument, I think both you guys ought to cool it. I was director of ParaNet at the time Cooper was logging on, and it was my decision to keep all of his and John Lear's files public, and I commend Rick for doing the same. *My* reasoning was that it was important for those people who had not made up their minds on the issue to be given everything they needed in order to do so. I felt confident that Cooper would simply hang himself with his own words, but regardless of that, its always been my feeling that we have nothing to fear from ideas. The good ones should be presented so that they may be acted on, and the bad ones, so that they may stand as examples of how NOT to think. I suspect that if Rick kept the files up because he damn well felt like it, this may be WHY he damn well felt like it.

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Bill cooper
Date: 21 Mar 91 07:21:49 GMT

OK, Jim, for the record, you have bluntly stated that

(1) my intentions are less than honourable
(2) I lobby against deleting Bill Cooper's files because of ulterior
    motives
(3) I'm closed-minded
(4) someone who calls himself a skeptic can't be open-minded

You are perfectly entitled to your opinion on these matters, and I make
a firm policy of never arguing with such views.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--
Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Fireball clippings
Date: 20 Mar 91 07:41:01 GMT

  Interesting huh. Note that in the first AP report, the pilots
reported that the object was moving about over NYC. I have a copy of a
later AP report that eliminates the pilots altogether.

                                        jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)

Subject: Goof
Date: 21 Mar 91 06:06:00 GMT

> Is she the former Aileen Edwards of Seattle?
>
> Jim

Yup.

Don

--
Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper
Date: 21 Mar 91 06:37:00 GMT

Jim;

Excuse me for jumping in about your message to Rick Moen, but I have to state that as one of the old timers here in ParaNet, I have "known" Rick for quite some time. Rick can NOT be accused of being "close" minded, but he does ask questions. That does not make him a bad guy. Checking my dictionary skeptic was listed as: n. doubt in absence of conclusive evidence; and BROTHER does that describe Mr. Cooper!

As one who did a two part investigation in Mr. Milton Wm. Cooper, I can tell you first hand that Cooper is at the forfront of lacking ANY CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE. As a matter of fact, several months ago I used the word CHARLATAN in reference to Cooper, (and I was being nice to boot) and Mr. Moen chided me for the adjective. Skeptic? Yep, Mr. Moen is that and he uses it in his origin line. Close minded? No I do not agree. I had a sighting myself, and a dramatic one at that, and I believe in the possibilty of ET life. However I to am a SKEPTIC I do not believe in allowing my mind to be so open that my brains tumble out _ I may never find them! GRIN

DON

--
Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Elizabeth.Anderson@p0.f30.n134.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Elizabeth Anderson)
Subject: Re: New Paranet Affiliate
Date: 23 Mar 91 00:35:00 GMT

Hello and best regards from Calgary.

Jerry has very kindly asked me to be a co-sysop on his board, Just Talk, so that I can be the sysop for Paranet - which I nagged him into getting up in the first place. So, you won't be seeing much of Jerry, though I am sure you'll be hearing a lot from me!

I am the founder of the Alberta Skeptics, a small but increasing vocal group with a lot to say. I would say that the group's main concern currently is to prevent the teaching of creationism in the public schools - hardly a Paranet topic. However, there is a large new age community in southern Alberta, and certainly much interest in paranormal subjects. My personal hobby-horse is satanism, and I had done a great deal of research into the subject. My degree is in medieval studies, from the University of Toronto, so I feel I have a good background to work from. UFOs are something I know a fair amount about, not so much because I am interested especially, but more because of the 'ancient astronaut' claims. I attended the CSICOP workshop on UFOs in Tucson last November and had a wonderful time. I look forward to much interesting discussion.

And I do a great tarot reading too!

Elizabeth

--
Elizabeth Anderson - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Elizabeth.Anderson@p0.f30.n134.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)
Subject: Gravitational Magnetism
Date: 23 Mar 91 03:41:00 GMT

To: violet.berkeley.edu!chalmers

> >
> >
> > It might be interesting to consider gravity as the
> > resultant of mass and time.
> >
> Nope, not a chance, not even a small probability.

Why not, Kurt? Please tell us more!

Clark

--
Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)
Subject: Hello & Have You Heard???
Date: 23 Mar 91 18:49:00 GMT

Hello Elizabeth and welcome to ParaNet!

I am hoping you can steer me in the right direction for some research I'm doing. Any assistance you could provide off-the-cuff would be greatly appreciated.

In the Northwest Territories, there's a river called the Nahani River. I believe it's just north of Atla or Sask. Could you tell me if the river runs through a national park or wildlife preserve, and if it's accessible by road? Supposedly it's home to a lot of Bigfoot. (Bigfeet?)

Ultimately, I'd like to speak to or write any local park rangers or law enforcement personnel in the area in question. If you could just tell me which town or ranger station I should try calling, I'd really appreciate it. The people at the Consulate General in N.Y.C. are greatly amused at my phone calls...

Thanks in advance for any help you can offer, and welcome once again!

Best,
Clark

--
Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: New Paranet Affiliate
Date: 23 Mar 91 21:07:00 GMT

> Hello and best regards from Calgary.
>
Hello, and welcome, Elizabeth! Glad to see we're getting more active skeptics online. I've been bugging Mike Stackpole for years to log in and bat things back and forth with us - he's the head of the Phoenix Skeptics, and you may know of him from some of his own studies on Satanism. And of course, Rick Moen of the Bay Area Skeptics is also with us, though he has now admitted to being a closed-minded government disinformation agent. <grin>

Look forward to some interesting conversations with you and your comrades in that neck of the woods.

Jim Speiser

PS: I'm a long-time creation-basher myself, though I agree that this is probably not the place for it. That's a never-ending argument; here we prefer to stick to things that, at least in theory, have SOME chance of being resolved (like....<sheepish grin>...UFOs...?)

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: gatech!apple.com!well!ddrasin
Subject: Openmindedness and psychic phenomena
Date: 25 Mar 91 00:53:21 GMT

From: gatech!apple.com!well!ddrasin (Dan Drasin)

(I submitted the following last week, but evidently due to your Domain Address problem you never received it. So here it is again, with a few minor editorial revisions:)

+ It is not so much that I don't believe that 'channeling' is real,
+ but more, what scientific methods can be applied to study the
+ phenomena? I was talking with a person the other day who told me that

+ there have been some solid-based scientific research done regarding
+ psychic phenomenon. Does anyone have any information relating
+ scientific research being conducted to validate psychic phenomenon?

Mike, I think you'd agree that whenever anything gets pushed underground or declared taboo in a society a great deal of folklore gets generated about how there's 'no evidence' for such-and-such. This produces more 'religion' (which involves a-priori preclusiveness, true-belief-based circular reasoning and the avoidance of uncomfortable revelations) than 'science' (which is theoretically based upon openmindedness, responsiblity, etc.). Try proposing the establishment of a procedurally-impeccable parapsychology department at any major university and see how quickly the vaunted concept of academic freedom becomes circumscribed by ignorance and fear.

The Journals of the Society for Psychical Research (Britain) and the ASPR (US) have been published for many decades, and a perusal of same should keep any earnest researcher busy for a long time. You also might check out the recent work done at Princeton that analyzes decades of experiments by many researchers using random number generators with psychics under controlled conditions. There is a conference on the WELL bbs here in the SF Bay Area (415-332-6106) called the 'fringes' conference. Topic 11 in that conference is devoted to the 'Princeton PK Review' and would be a good place to start familiarizing yourself with that material.

You might also check out a book, THE WORLD OF TED SERIOS (*Second* Edition), by Jule Eisenbud, M.D., (C) 1989, published by McFarland & Co., Inc, Box 611, Jefferson, NC 28640. It is a fascinating account of one of the most copiously evidential parapsychological cases on record. It also contains a scathing account of James Randi's clumsy attempts to squirm out of his own claims and 'offers' with regard to this case. This book (not to be confused with the *first* edition, published in 1967) was published privately and is in limited circulation, but should be available from the publisher.

You also might check out John Klimo's book on channeling (sorry, the title escapes me at the moment).

+ I've always been strongly in favour of open-mindedness -- as long as
+ your mind isn't so open that things flutter in and out.

Rick, I've heard variations on this from skeptics for a long time. It's usually '...as long as your mind isn't so open that your brains fall out.' Pray tell, Rick, just what does this mean? Just exactly what are the prescribed limits to openmindedness, and who gets to do the prescribing for everyone else?

In the end, statements like this (lighthearted though they may sometimes be) seem to betray a confusion between openmindedness on the one hand and sloppy science on the other.

This falls into the same category as the statement 'extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof' -- because (apart from the double-standard implied here, which science is never supposed to tolerate) nobody has ever defined what 'ordinary' (and therefore "extra-ordinary') means. And never will because the definition of what's 'ordinary' evolves constantly. And besides, "ordinariness" is not a part of scientific method. Never was, and never will be. In science, openmindedness and procedural integrity take precedence. Everything else is secondary.

That statement is also frequently used to discourage honest research into certain subjects -- as if 'proof' were the *first* stage in an investigation instead of the last. In other words, a (real or imagined) lack of proof is often used to rationalize avoiding the very investigation that would be required to develop such proof in the first place.

If anything, 'extraordinary' claims (assuming one is interested enogh to follow them up in the first place) require extraordinarily openiminded, careful and resourceful science. Period.

From: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: Rick Redux
Date: 24 Mar 91 06:58:00 GMT

> In order to save echo bandwidth, I've decided to
> change my mind and admit publicly that I'm really a closed-minded zealot
> who's here to attack people for their beliefs, ignore overwhelming
> evidence that might serve to undermine my faith in my ideology and divert
> me from my hidden agenda, and basically to test how dark the depths of
> my soul really are.

Ah Ha! I knew it all along.... I bet you < GASP!! > even write letters to Phil < GASP > KLASS!! Out with the stake Mike, we got one to burn!

GRIN

Don

--
Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: boulder!conncoll.bitnet!gateh
Subject: Australian SETI success?
Date: 25 Mar 91 14:39:42 GMT

From: boulder!conncoll.bitnet!gateh (Gregg TeHennepe)

I saw a couple of queries in the Space digest (as well as a
reference in the RISKs digest) to reports on Australian(?) news
that an Australian radio observatory had received what they thought
were intelligent signals of non-earth origin. Has anybody else heard
about this, or any possible follow-ups? There was no response (or
even interest, it seemed) in the Space digest, which I thought
somewhat unusual.

Gregg TeHennepe | SysAdm, Academic Computing
gateh@conncoll.bitnet | Connecticut College, New London, CT

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Rick Redux
Date: 25 Mar 91 02:10:00 GMT

 > In order to save echo bandwidth, I've decided to change my mind

  The truth is out! You're really Bill Cooper! ;-)

                                          jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Ss433
Date: 26 Mar 91 05:00:00 GMT

*** Quoting John Powell to Mark Freel ***
 > In a message to Gregg Gillis <16 Mar 91 12:49> Mark Freel

> wrote:
> MF> This is from _The_Quest_for_SS433_ by David H. Clark
> (1985)...
>
> MF> _IF_ it had moved 10000 light years in the last six
> years to the outer
> MF> edge of our solar system, a degree in astrophysics would
> be worth ... ?

10000 light years in 6 years? I'm not sure how that statement is being used, but if the author (David Clark) was not trying to be funny, then he has a serious problem on his hands... how to explain faster-than-light travel.

What I am confused about is: SS433 is a stellar object, fully described and explained in the appropriate scientific journals by professional astronomers and physicists. It is not an object entering our own solar system, manned by reptile creature intent on invading Earth, driven by atomic engines. Why then, in the face of professional and vastly more educated information, do some people cling desperately to the idea that this is indeed an alien spaceship with evil designs on Earth? I'd say off-hand, you're looking at a psychological anomaly. . .

Cheers!

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Internet Difficulties
Date: 26 Mar 91 06:07:00 GMT

Anyone posting an article via Internet during approximately March 20 through March 25 is
encouraged to repost it. We experienced network difficulties and some of the articles may have bounced. We apologize for any inconvenience.

Thanks for your patience and understanding.

Michael Corbin
Director

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: The mutliation factor
Date: 26 Mar 91 06:09:00 GMT

There has been some recent interest in the cattle mutilation mystery as it may apply to the UFO enigma. Below is a reprint of an article prepared and contributed to ParaNet by Don Ecker regarding a possible human mutilation which displayed "classic" markings of those found common in cattle mutilations.

This file was provided by ParaNet(sm) Information Service
and its network of international affiliates.
You may freely distribute this file as long as this header
remains intact.
Contributed by: Don Ecker, ParaNet Staff Writer
==========
For further information on ParaNet(sm), contact:
Michael Corbin
ParaNet Information Service
P.O. Box 928
Wheatridge, CO 80034-0928
or
Netmail 1:104/422
==========
(C) 1991 by Don Ecker.

The Human Mutilation Factor

by Don Ecker

In the last forty years of UFO research, one of the most baffling questions that have plagued researchers has been "Is the UFO Phenomenon dangerous to humanity?" Over the years, there have been numerous cases where the phenomenon has figured into human deaths, but as a rule, most cases have been officially ruled accidental. When speaking of cases where death has resulted, usually most assume cases where military pilots have died as a result of "chasing" the phenomenon. One of the most famous of these military chases that is discussed when ever the subject of death and UFOs is raised, is the famous "Mantell Case". This case is so well known that I will not discuss it here, but there are many others. In one of the less well known cases, during the mid 1950's, a military jet interceptor was observed on radar being "absorbed" into a UFO over the Great Lakes. No trace of pilot or aircraft was ever found. In another case reported in the excellent work "Clear Intent" was the case of the "Cuban MIG Incident". In this case a Cuban MIG was locking on his weapons radar when the aircraft exploded in mid*air. The wing man was certain that the UFO had fired some type

of weapon, but other than the jet exploding, no other smoke, flame or other obvious weapon firing was observed.

The matter of either overt or covert hostility on the part of UFOs has always been treated warily by serious researchers. On the one hand, if the enigma is hostile, then several questions must be faced. What if anything should the powers in authority tell the public? Is the government capable of handling a threat of this type? Is the public ready to face an issue as potentially terrifying as a "possible threat from somewhere else?" Other than incidents involving military involvement, have there been cases where civilians have been injured or killed during some type of UFO encounter? Is it possible that the reported cases of UFOs and their occupants abducting unwilling humans for some type of medical or genetic experimentation could be true? Now, if any of this is factual, then what ramifications do the Human Race face in light of the above?

According to Mr. Phil Imbrogno, during the research that led to the writing of "NIGHT SIEGE The Hudson Valley UFO Sightings" by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Philip Imbrogno, and Bob Pratt, Imbrogno has stated that on several occasions, Hynek specified that he wanted no mention of the dozens of human abductions that they had already uncovered at that time, to be mentioned in the book. Hynek was afraid of the adverse publicity if word of this aspect leaked out to the public. After Hyneks death, Imbrogno stated publicly on Compuserve and other public forums, facts of abductions, animal mutilations, and EVEN several cases of mysterious deaths of humans, that he indicated COULD possibly be linked to the UFO Phenomenon.

While researching several stories for UFO Magazine, I interviewed a number of prominent UFOlogists, over the last several months, and in each case, the question of human deaths, in connection with animal mutilations, invariably was raised. Most readers of this text will be familiar with Mr. John Keel, who many regard as the last of the Great UFOlogists. From the earliest days of modern UFOlogy, Keel has been a force to reckon with. The author of numerous books that address various aspects of UFOlogy, and magazine articles too numerous to mention, Keel has a unique slant on the subject that most will never experience. According to Keel, the phenomenon has always had an unexplained hostility towards humans, that have led to untold numbers of deaths. While Keel will be the first to explain that he rejects the ET hypothesis, he does not doubt the phenomenon a bit. In what many UFOlogists consider as one of Keels best works "The Mothman Prophecies", E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1975, Keel related report after report of animal mutilations involving cattle, dogs, horses and sheep, and also related what were called "vampire killings" of four humans in Yugoslavia, were the victims were "mutilated and drained of blood".

After having spoken to John Ford, the Chairman of the Long Island UFO Network, for a news story for UFO Magazine, I became even

more convinced that the aspect of potential UFO hostility should be investigated. Ford relayed a numbing number of animal mutilations, human disappearances, human abductions, covert Federal involvement in areas that suffered high numbers of animal mutilations, and even armed military helicopters that chased UFOs over civilian communities. Ford, who is a officer of the Federal Court system, did investigations into the disappearances of mostly young adults over a year period, in areas of high UFO overflights, and after having several personal friends who were police officers of the local municipalities look into the situation, came to the conclusion that the facts were being suppressed. The reason given was that there was "no need to panic the public." Although no iron clad proof can be made for direct UFO intervention, the circumstances are extremely suspect.

After growing up in an age where the entire human race can be decimated by nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, the human race somehow manages to keep slogging on. I have seen more people "panicked" over a shortage of gasoline than imminent nuclear holocaust, yet somehow when the subject of UFOs crop up, the government doesn't want to panic anyone. It really makes me wonder what they know, that I should. I really don't think that they are going to talk to anyone soon, as you shall soon see.

<<Continued in next message..>>

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
  {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

**********The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********